

REMARKS

Claims 1, 12, 16, 18, 20, 23, and 25-28 have been amended, and claims 2, 13, 14 and 19 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-12, 15-18, and 20-28 are pending.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Barnett (6,369,840 B1) in view of Sciammarella (5,982,369).

As amended, claim 1 recites a method, in a product search engine, for displaying search results in response to a search query, comprising:

obtaining a product search query generated by a user;

obtaining search results comprising a set of links, each of the links being associated with a web document determined to be responsive to the query; and

displaying the set of links in an order corresponding to a relevance ranking and according to a plurality of user-selectable formats, wherein the plurality of user-selectable formats includes a grid view and a list view, **wherein the grid view is comprised of a plurality of cells, each cell displaying information corresponding to one product, and every cell displaying information about a different product.**

Applicants maintain that the claims are patentable over the applied references.

Barnett discusses generating and displaying a calendar of events associated with a plurality of categories. (Abstract.) As the reference makes clear, the events are chronologically displayed, regardless of whether they appear in list or calendar form. (Barnett, Figs. 7A- 10) In Barnett, there is no indication that a relevance ranking is determined. Indeed, the words “rank” and “ranking” cannot be found anywhere in Barnett.

In addition, Barnett does not display the results in a grid view comprised of a plurality of cells, each cell displaying information corresponding to one product, and every cell

displaying information about a different product. Rather, Barnett displays only the links to event tickets in a calendar view. The calendar view of Barnett has multiple events occurring on the same day (cell in the calendar), as well as some days (cells in the calendar) during which no tickets are available. As such, these elements are not disclosed by Barnett.

The Examiner relies on the Sciammarella reference as disclosing displaying information representing search results in an order corresponding to a relevance ranking. However, the Sciammarella reference does not disclose displaying the set of links in an order corresponding to a relevance ranking and according to a plurality of user-selectable formats, wherein the plurality of user-selectable formats includes a grid view and a list view. Rather, Sciammarella displays search results in a pyramid form to indicate relevance. (Sciammarella, Fig. 2, col. 3, lines 1-48). Thus, Sciammarella does not provide “displaying the set of links in an order corresponding to a relevance ranking and according to a plurality of user-selectable formats, wherein the plurality of user-selectable formats includes a grid view and a list view.” Indeed, Sciammarella does not provide any disclosure of a grid view whatsoever, let alone a grid view comprised of a plurality of cells, each cell displaying information corresponding to one product, and every cell displaying information about a different product.

The arguments made with respect to claim 1 also apply to claims 12, 16, 18, 20, and 23. Claims 3-6, 8-12 and 25 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1; claims 15 and 26 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12; claim 27 depends from claim 16; claim 28 depends from claim 18; claim 21 depends from claim 20; claim 24 depends from claim 23. In addition to containing all of the limitations from the claims from which they depend,

respectively, these claims also contain additional limitations that are not shown by the applied references.

With regard to claims 7, 17 and 22, although the Examiner states that these claims were rejected over Barnett in view of Sciammarella, it appears that the rejection relies solely on Barnett and what the Examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art would find obvious. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use “pictures to accommodate products, because Barnett suggest[s] that one skilled in the art will recognize that other visual characteristics could be used to associate products such as a distinctive icon or other technique.” (Office Action, page 12). However, the language of Barnett states that the visual characteristics can be “used to associate events with categories.” (col. 13, lines 18-21). Barnett does not mention, hint or suggest that one might include an associated picture, image or pictorial representation of a product, as recited in claim 7. Rather, Barnett is focused on using visual characteristics to associate events with categories. In addition, claim 7 incorporates the limitations of its respective base claim and is allowable at least for the reasons discussed above. Claims 17 and 22 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable over the applied references for the reasons described above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
CRAIG NEVILL-MANNING, ET AL.

Date: December 28, 2007

By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com